

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/695,756		10/30/2003	Yoshiaki Kohama	107322.02	6180	
25944	7590	02/08/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & I	3ERRII	OGE, PLC	VANORE, DAVID A			
P.O. BOX 1						
ALEXAND	RIA, V	A 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2881		
				DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			H
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/695,756	KOHAMA, YOSHIAKI	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David A Vanore	2881	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repreply within the statutory minimum of thirty and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
, ,	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	wance except for formal matte	• •	its is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Irawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	are: a) \square accepted or b) \square ob he drawing(s) be held in abeyand rection is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Burn * See the attached detailed Office action for a light service.	ents have been received. ents have been received in Ap riority documents have been r eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No. <u>09/664,136</u> . received in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/	08) 5) Notice of Inf	/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/03</u> .	6) Other:	_	

Application/Control Number: 10/695,756

Art Unit: 2881

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 through 10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,677,587 (KOHAMA et al.). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons:

Pending claim 1 conflicts with patented claim 1 where patented claim 1 recites a TDI sensor in place of the sensor of claim 1. Since a TDI sensor is a still a sensor, patented claim 1 does conflict with pending claim 1.

Pending claim recites that a primary optical system shapes a beam into an elliptical form. Patented claims 1 and 2 recite the primary optical system and the shaping of the beam into rectangular form. The specification further states at Col. 10 Lines 51-57 that beam shaping may produce a rectangular or elliptical conformation. Therefore, it is apparent from the specification that in the practice of the invention that

Application/Control Number: 10/695,756

Art Unit: 2881

shaping the beam into a rectangular or elliptical conformation are substantially equivalent, and therefore, patented claim 2 conflicts with pending claim 2.

Pending claim 3 recites that which is noted above in regards to patented claim 2.

Pending claim 4 depends on pending claim 1 and is identical to patented claim 3.

Therefore, pending claim 4 is in conflict with patented claims 1 and 3.

Pending claim 5 is in conflict with patented claim 4.

Pending claim 6 is in conflict with patented claim 5.

Pending claim 7 is in conflict with patented claim 6.

Pending claim 8 is in conflict with patented claim 4. Though claim 4 does not recite the laser interferometer of pending claim 8, the position compensation signal recited in claim 4 is derived from positional information read by a laser interferometer as recited in the specification (Col. 7 Line 60 to Col. 8 Line 7), therefore, the laser interferometer recited in pending claim 8 is required for the practice of the invention in patented claim 4.

Pending claim 9 is in conflict with patented claim 4 because patented claim 4 contains all the limitations of pending claim 8 and further comprises a secondary optical system.

Pending claim 10 is in conflict with patented claim 1.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A Vanore whose telephone number is (571) 272-2483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2477. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dav

CAN R. LEE

SORY PATENT EXAMINER

OCY COTTER 2800